



City of Seattle

Department of Planning and Development
Diane M. Sugimura, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS, RECOMMENDATION AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**

Application Numbers: 3012337
Applicant Name: Studio Meng Strazzara
Address of Proposal: 1145 10th Avenue East

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTIONS

Land Use Application to allow a three story, building with 70 residential units and parking for 85 vehicles located below grade. Review includes demolition of one residential structure and 8,870 cubic yards of grading.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review - Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) Section 23.41

SEPA - Environmental Determination pursuant to SMC 25.05

SEPA DETERMINATION: ☐ Exempt ☐ DNS ☐ MDNS ☐ EIS

☒ DNS with conditions*

☐ DNS involving non-exempt grading or demolition or
involving another agency with jurisdiction

* Notice of the Early Determination of Non-significance was published on January 23, 2012.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to design and construct a three-story residential structure with 70 units on the block bound by Broadway East, 10th Avenue East and East Highland Drive. 85 parking spaces would be provided below grade accessed from E. Highland Dr. The proposal would require demolition of a duplex and a 74 space parking lot.

At the initial Early Design Guidance meeting, the applicant presented three alternative design scenarios. Common to the schemes is vehicular approach from Broadway E. and a below-grade garage. An “L” shape design has its two wings front onto Broadway E. and E. Highland Dr. The wings form a square shaped court or open space at the site’s southeast corner facing 10th Ave E. and the adjacent townhouses to the south. The residential lobby lies along E. Highland Dr. Alternative Two, a “U” shape scheme, forms an auto court facing Broadway E. A sizeable passenger drop-off area and garage entry consumes most of the frontage on Broadway E. The complex’s perimeter walls line E. Highland Dr., 10th Ave. E. and the south property line. In plan, this scheme does not have the amounts of open space the other options offer. The bulk of the “T” shape scheme, the third option, forms a three-story wall along Broadway. A perpendicular wing extends along an east west axis toward 10th Ave. East forming two open spaces on either side of it. The primary pedestrian entrance occurs in this scheme on E. Highland similar to the first option.

Several additional design alternatives emerged at the second EDG meeting. Option 1 met the city of Seattle Land Use Code requirements. This scheme, a single rectangular structure, extends its length along the east/west axis. This alternative preserves the trees near the north and south property lines. A cluster of trees on the east and west property lines may not be preserved in this scheme. Based on the Board’s earlier request, the applicant presented Options 2A and 2B. Rising above a below grade parking garage (as all options do), these alternatives form two detached structures roughly mirroring one another with a courtyard in between. Option 2A’s length extends along the north and south axis. Paired option 2B orientates the twin structures with the long axis running east and west. The third option, a reorientation of an alternative shown at the initial EDG meeting, flips the “L” shape by positioning the open space at the site’s southwest corner facing Broadway E. with the long exterior walls at E. Highland and 10th Ave. E. This scheme attempts to preserve most of the trees lining the property lines with the exception of several on 10th Ave. E. Each of the options shows a curb cut and driveway on E. Highland.

By the Recommendation meeting, the applicant had refined the “L” shaped scheme with the courtyard oriented to Broadway E. and placed the formal residential entry onto 10th Ave E. and the garage access on E. Highland Dr.

SITE & VICINITY

The 40,000 square foot site lies within a Lowrise Three (LR 3) zone. A two-story duplex occupies the southeast corner of the development site. Surface parking covers much of the rest of the development site. A curb cut on E. Highland Dr. provides egress to the parking lot. Mature trees ring the site’s perimeter. A Big Leaf Maple, designated an exceptional tree, lies near the site’s northwest corner.

Lowrise Three (LR3) zoning surrounds the immediate site with single family zones beginning west of Harvard Avenue East and along Federal Avenue East. LR 3 follows 10th Ave. to the south until E. Roy St. North of the properties facing E. Highland Dr. the zoning transitions to Single Family 5000.

Apartment and condominium buildings represent the bulk of the structures to the east, west and south of the project site. Trinity Lutheran Church occupies the northeast corner of 10th Ave E. and E. Highland Dr. The City of Seattle Parks and Recreation Department controls an area of mostly steep slopes to the south and west of St. Mark's Episcopal Cathedral, north of E. Highland Dr. City of Seattle's Volunteer Park lies about a block to the east. Predominate land uses includes multifamily housing, institutions and park land. Although the site is relatively level, the terrain descends from the east to west by approximately eight feet.

ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW

Public Comments

Approximately forty members of the public attended the initial Early Design Guidance meeting (September 21, 2011). The following issues were raised:

Massing

Nearly everyone who spoke objected to the proposal's massiveness. No residential building in the immediate neighborhood has a footprint the size of the proposal.

- The five buildings that comprise the Harvard-Highland project are all considerably smaller than the three alternatives proposed.
- The building's size and massing should be compatible with the neighborhood. The proposed size is inappropriate.
- The three alternatives are three times the size of residential buildings in the vicinity.
- The proposal should have four buildings with a great internal courtyard.
- The buildings should set back at the third floor.
- Screen the mechanical equipment as residents of taller buildings in the area will see it.
- A solid unbroken wall on 10th Ave E. is undesirable.
- The structure will block light to surrounding homes.
- Massive, long walls don't fit the neighborhood. A large wall on 10th would not be pleasant.

Open Space/ Landscaping

- Site the open space on a quiet street. Focus it towards Broadway.
- Multiple open spaces are preferable.
- Break up the open space into more discrete spaces.
- Residents should want to use the open space. Having it face noisy 10th Ave E. will diminish the usability of the court.
- The fountain will not be seen by the public.
- Flip the "L-shaped" scheme to place open space on Broadway E.
- As the project evolves, the proposed 12' planted area inward of the sidewalk should be retained.

Access to Parking

There was nearly unanimous opposition to garage access on Broadway Ave. E. Speakers requested the use of either 10th Ave. E. or E. Highland Dr. as access to the parking garage.

- A thoughtful design would make access on 10th Ave. work.
- Broadway E. is the most residential and least likely for parking access.
- Create two levels of parking with access from different streets. Public parking ought to occur on 10th Ave. E. Parking for residents should occur on Highland Dr.
- Parking access on 10th Ave would be a disaster.

Parking

- Don't displace on-street parking.
- Don't preclude visitor parking on-site.
- There is limited amount of on-street parking. Spill over parking is an important concern.
- Double the amount of available parking.

Preservation of Trees

- There are 48 trees with diameters 6 inches or greater. Many of these trees are very large and appear more significant than what is depicted in the design review proposal.
- The proposed removal of so many trees is alarming.
- Don't remove the large maples on the northeast and southwest corners.
- The mature trees provide privacy. Save all of the trees along Broadway.

Character of Design

- The proposal has too many materials. Most structures in the Harvard Belmont Historic District have just one or two materials.
- The facades should be more traditional in appearance.
- The proposed design doesn't at all equal the historic context as suggested by the architect. The materials and composition are too much of a hodge-podge.
- How does the design benefit the neighborhood?
- Due to the site's adjacency to the Harvard-Belmont Historic District, the design should be much more sympathetic.
- The building should not look like the Harvard – Highland complex. Eclectic is better. Shake up the design. Buildings designed by Gordon Walker and Ralph Anderson in the near vicinity add to the neighborhood character.
- Use Portland's Pearl District to inform the design. Add porches and townhomes to the project.
- Strive for compatible facades.

Departure requests

All of the speakers addressing the departure requests opposed an allowance to increase the structure width from 120 feet to 180 feet. The speakers stated that the departure would only serve to augment the building's massiveness.

Several speakers opposed reducing the curb cut width.

Programming

- The Harvard Highland's complex houses 38 families in five buildings. The proposal is much too big and dense.

By the initial EDG meeting, DPD received approximately 67 letters concerning the proposal. A large percentage of these letters stated a similar theme: direct future residential traffic away from Broadway East and towards E. Highland Dr. where there are fewer residences along the street. The entrance to the parking garage as well as the collection of garbage and recycling should take place on 10th Ave E. or on E. Highland Dr. Many letters urged the project proponents to decrease the density, reduce the building size, increase the amount of parking spaces, preserve the large, mature trees, maintain the value of the neighboring properties by increasing the size and quality of the apartments. For those who commented on architectural design, the project should either add to the eclecticism of the neighborhood or mirror the predominant aesthetic of the Harvard Belmont neighborhood.

At the second Early Design Guidance meeting (November 16, 2011), 22 members of the public affixed their names to the sign-in sheet. Those who spoke raised the following issues:

Massing

- Massing should reflect the characteristics of the neighborhood.
- Townhouses to the south (on 10th Ave.) will face a large wall.
- Set back the third story at units # 3-11 to reduce the bulk. This would provide a transition along the north and east portions of the building. (Favored by several speakers.)
- The third story setback is successful on the Harvard-Highland project.
- Reduce the structure's size.

Structure Orientation

- The 90 degree change in orientation makes no sense economically or aesthetically. It doubles the number of residences on 10th Ave.
- Residents of the townhouses to the south lose natural light resulting as well in a loss of property value.
- Many others stated their preference for the new orientation of the "L" shaped scheme.

Lobby Orientation

- Shift lobby to 10th Ave where unit # 8 would be. (Recommended by several people.)
- Place lobby at unit # 18 off the courtyard. This would create a grand entrance to the courtyard. (Recommended by several people.)
- Move the lobby away from Highland Dr.

Building Appearance

- Don't make a copy of the Harvard-Highland project.
- Use the best quality of brick from the ground to the top of the building. Retaining walls should also be brick.

Landscaping/Open Space

- Screen the roof garden from the street. Avoid the neighbors. (Recommended by several speakers.)
- Shifting the open space to the SW corner is unfair. There is the loss of natural light for those who live directly to the south off 10th Ave. The residents who live across the street on Broadway have the right of way between them and the proposed structure. Those who live due south have no open area between their units and the proposed mass.
- Preferable to have the courtyard on the southwest portion of the site. (Favored by several speakers.)

Traffic/Parking

- E. Highland is a narrow street. Placing the garage on Highland would place too much traffic on the street.
- Prefers placing parking on 10th Ave.
- Traffic on 10th Ave is busy. It is too dangerous to have access there.

DPD received approximately 51 letters immediately prior to and after the second EDG meeting. Upon viewing the design review packet at the DPD web site, the authors of the earlier letters commented on the new orientation of the driveway, the extent of the massing and scale, setbacks, materials and the relationship of the courtyard to the Broadway street level. Comments both agreed and disagreed with the orientation of the “L” shaped mass (Option 3).

After the 2nd EDG meeting, many of the letters and emails conveyed a misinterpretation of the Board’s guidance. The authors had the impression that the Board preferred Option 2B, a two structure scheme. The priorities and guidance below indicates the Board’s interest in development of either Option 2B or 3. The bulk of the deliberation, however, focused on modifications to the latter option (the “L” shaped scheme) with an understanding of the applicant’s preference for Option 3. All correspondence is available for review at DPD. Some letters received opposed having open space facing Broadway preferring either placement of the open space along 10th Ave or the two building scheme.

GUIDELINES

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponent, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the siting and design guidance described below and identified highest priority by letter and number from the guidelines found in the City of Seattle’s “Design Review: Guidelines for Multi-family and Commercial Buildings”.

PRIORITIES

A. Site Planning

- A-1 Responding to Site Characteristics. The siting of buildings should respond to specific site conditions and opportunities such as non-rectangular lots, location on prominent intersections, unusual topography, significant vegetation and views or other natural features.**

The Board acknowledged that the mature trees contribute greatly to the character of the neighborhood. The architect's distribution of open space on the site should allow for the integration of existing mature trees into the design. (September 21, 2011)

A-2 Streetscape Compatibility. The siting of buildings should acknowledge and reinforce the existing desirable spatial characteristics of the right-of-way.

The generous setbacks from the street with lush plantings as shown at the EDG meeting appealed to the Board. (September 21, 2011)

A-4 Human Activity. New development should be sited and designed to encourage human activity on the street.

A-5 Respect for Adjacent Sites. Buildings should respect adjacent properties by being located on their sites to minimize disruption of the privacy and outdoor activities of residents in adjacent buildings.

The Board asked for reconsideration of the proposed structure's relationship to the townhouses to the south in order to respect the proximity of the neighboring townhouses. Terracing of a portion of the structure closest to the property line represents one technique.

A-7 Residential Open Space. Residential projects should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space.

The Board conveyed its desire for open space to fulfill the following objectives: preservation of mature trees, usability for residents, an orientation that receives the most use (most likely on the southwest), provides a gesture to the neighborhood and complements or reinforces a reduced mass of the building(s). The Board clearly preferred a distribution of open space that forms a meaningful series of discrete and intimate landscaped areas rather than a large concentrated space. (September 21, 2011)

The revisions proposed at the second EDG meeting preserved most of the trees and reoriented the "L" shaped mass to place the largest amount of open space at the site's southwest corner. The Board urged continued refinement of the mass and its relationship to the open space. Reiterating a desire to have discrete and intimate open spaces along with the grander space, the Board requested that the modulation or articulation of the facades establish more clearly defined setbacks. Within these setbacks, the open spaces should possess form and purpose. These ought to occur along 10th Ave E. near the south property line, at the corner of E. Highland Dr. and 10th Ave., and near the corner of E. Highland Dr. and Broadway.

In particular the diagonal or chamfered corner at E. Highland and 10th Ave. should be reconfigured to expose the ends of the building to imply separate masses, forming a well defined open space to anchor this corner. Likewise, judicious modification of the southern portion of the structure would create a greater sense of openness between the proposal and the townhouses directly to the south. (November 16, 2011)

A-8 Parking and Vehicle Access. Siting should minimize the impact of automobile parking and driveways on the pedestrian environment, adjacent properties, and pedestrian safety.

Responding to clear and emphatic public opposition to a Broadway garage entrance, the Board asked the applicant to explore the implications of access on both E. Highland Dr. and Broadway E. A 10th Ave. E. curb cut received less support from the Board members; however, if the applicant can present a viable 10th Ave. ingress and egress, the Board would consider it. For the next EDG meeting, the applicant will need to provide a scheme showing access from E. Highland Dr.

The Board conveyed its openness to accepting a reduced curb cut width. (September 21, 2011)

The Board agreed with the change of location for the curb cut and garage entry to E. Highland Dr. (November 16, 2011)

B. Height, Bulk and Scale

B-1 Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility. Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to near-by, less intensive zones. Projects on zone edges should be developed in a manner that creates a step in perceived height, bulk, and scale between anticipated development potential of the adjacent zones.

The Board noted the lack of a code compliant alternative. The omission made it difficult for the reviewers to understand how much massing ought to be placed on the site. The footprints of each of the three alternatives were considerably larger than any residential building in the immediate neighborhood. The departure request for increased structure width exacerbates the sense that the proposal appears out of scale with the neighborhood.

For the next EDG meeting, the applicant will need to provide a viable code complying alternative and alternative(s) that have the appearance of smaller buildings or multiple building reflecting the footprint of residential structures in the vicinity. The integration of the Board's guidance on open space and streetscape compatibility is critical. The proposed setbacks and buildings should be dimensioned for the next review. (September 21, 2011)

Of the several design scenarios or options presented at the second EDG meeting, two emerged as possessing the most resonance, Option 2B, two structures above a parking garage and separate by an axial court, and Option #3 an "L" shaped scheme with the long ends of the wings facing E. Highland Dr. and 10th Ave. E. The wings of the latter structure would form a sizeable courtyard facing Broadway E. The Board found merit in both schemes if significant modifications were to occur; however, the better part of the deliberation was devoted to discussing the "L" shaped alternative.

The Board requested a more deliberate separation of the major parts of the building (Option 3) to clarify the shape of the mass and to simplify the articulation. As noted in A-7, the Board prefers the diagonal at the northeast corner reshaped to expose the ends of the two wings suggesting two separate masses. Reacting to the site plan of Option # 3 with its multiple changes of plane along the facades, the Board asked for a simpler articulation of the vertical plane yet allowing meaningful shifts in the façade at critical locations including the northeast corner, the southeast corner near the townhouses to the south and along E. Highland Dr. The Board asked that the next iteration respond to the adjacent townhouses to the south. One possible approach is to setback the upper level.

At the second EDG meeting, the Board discussed the idea of a setback at the structure's third level along E. Highland Dr. and 10th Ave. E.; in order to evaluate its necessity, the Board would like an analysis of the proposal's height in relationship to the neighboring structures. The Board members reserved recommending a modification to the third level until seeing further design development. (November 16, 2011)

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

C-1 Architectural Context. New buildings proposed for existing neighborhoods with a well-defined and desirable character should be compatible with or complement the architectural character and siting pattern of neighboring buildings.

Structure size, massing, the preservation of trees and the distribution of open space had the most bearing for the Board. The design should produce the same sense of intimacy that the neighborhood evokes. (September 21, 2011)

Use of a third floor setback along E. Highland and 10th Ave would depend upon the existing neighborhood content. The Board asked for an analysis of this before making a recommendation. See guidance B-1. (November 16, 2011)

C-2 Architectural Concept and Consistency. Building design elements, details and massing should create a well-proportioned and unified building form and exhibit an overall architectural concept. Buildings should exhibit form and features identifying the functions within the building. In general, the roofline or top of the structure should be clearly distinguished from its facade walls.

Seek refined facades without resorting to architectural elements (i.e. cornices and lintels) that might add clutter. (November 16, 2011)

C-3 Human Scale. The design of new buildings should incorporate architectural features, elements, and details to achieve a good human scale.

C-4 Exterior Finish Materials. Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.

C-5 Structured Parking Entrances. The presence and appearance of garage entrances should be minimized so that they do not dominate the street frontage of a building.

D. Pedestrian Environment

- D-1 Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances.** Convenient and attractive access to the building's entry should be provided. To ensure comfort and security, paths and entry areas should be sufficiently lighted and entry areas should be protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.

The Board prefers a more judicious distribution of open space over the site, one that supports the desire for a more discrete building mass and provides attractive, functional and well oriented open space that complements the overall pedestrian oriented neighborhood character. (September 21, 2011)

In agreement with recommendations made during the public comment period, the Board favored placement of the lobby at the courtyard or on 10th Ave. in order to relieve Highland Dr. from having both the entrance to the parking garage and the pedestrian lobby. Placement of the lobby entrance off the courtyard would provide better engagement of the courtyard with the street and add raison d'être to the court. In both locations, pairing the lobby and open space would benefit the project. (November 16, 2011)

- D-3 Retaining Walls.** Retaining walls near a public sidewalk that extend higher than eye level should be avoided where possible. Where higher retaining walls are unavoidable, they should be designed to reduce their impact on pedestrian comfort and to increase the visual interest along the streetscapes.

With the architect's reluctance to construct the parking garage at a lower depth, the formation of garage walls along the courtyard's perimeter (particularly on Broadway) places the open space at roughly four feet above sidewalk level. The Board prefers a softer edge along Broadway. Lowering the garage would eliminate the distance between the sidewalk level and the courtyard. Terracing the walls between the sidewalk and the courtyard would provide a raised landscaped edge. (November 16, 2011)

- D-5 Visual Impacts of Parking Structures.** The visibility of all at-grade parking structures or accessory parking garages should be minimized. The parking portion of a structure should be architecturally compatible with the rest of the structure and streetscape. Open parking spaces and carports should be screened from the street and adjacent properties.

The parking garage would likely have large screens to enable adequate ventilation. The presence of these vents on the public realm represents a concern. The design should minimize or eliminate their presence on the pedestrian. Location of the vents will need to be shown at the next meeting. (September 21, 2011)
See guidance for D-3. (November 16, 2011)

- D-6 Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities, and Service Areas.** Building sites should locate service elements like trash dumpsters, loading docks and mechanical equipment away from the street front where possible. When elements such as dumpsters, utility meters, mechanical units and service areas cannot be located away from the street front, they should be situated and screened from view and should not be located in the pedestrian right-of-way.

E. Landscaping

E-1 Landscaping to Reinforce Design Continuity with Adjacent Sites. Where possible, and where there is not another overriding concern, landscaping should reinforce the character of neighboring properties and abutting streetscape.

New concept drawings will need to show how the design reinforces the characteristics of the surrounding neighborhood. Generous setbacks and preservation of mature trees are important attributes. (September 21, 2011)

E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site. Landscaping, including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, site furniture, and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.

The Board questioned the necessity of placing useable open space on the roof. While many new projects have installed roof gardens in recent years, the generous amount of open space at the courtyard and along the edges would likely satisfy residential needs particularly if the design had amenities to accommodate the activities of the tenants. (November 16, 2011)

MASTER USE PERMIT APPLICATION

The applicant revised the design and applied for a Master Use Permit with a design review component on December 29, 2011.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The Design Review Board conducted a Final Recommendation Meeting on April 4, 2012 to review the applicant's formal project proposal developed in response to the previously identified priorities. At the public meetings, site plans, elevations, floor plans, landscaping plans, and computer renderings of the proposed exterior materials were presented for the Board members' consideration.

Public Comments

Approximately 21 members of the public affixed their names to the Recommendation meeting sign-in sheet. The public commented on the following issues:

Massing

- Many people who spoke supported the structure's orientation with its courtyard facing Broadway.
- Buildings on the north side of Highland Dr. have two stories. The third floor of the proposal should acknowledge the consistent height of structures on this street by stepping back.
- The "L" shaped mass creates winners and losers. If the Board and the city do not grant the departure request (structure width), all the neighbors will be winners. (This was mentioned by others.)
- The proposed design saves the most trees.

- Placing the courtyard on the southeast corner of the site would gather the noise from 10th Ave which would be a disservice to the residents.
- The departure for structure width is supportable. (Several members of the public expressed this sentiment.)
- Simplify the massing by eliminating much of the modulation.

Building and Courtyard Orientation

- The courtyard should face 10th Ave. E. rather than Broadway E.

Access

- The project lacks a drop-off area. At the very least, there should be on-street parking near the entrance with limits on the duration of parking.
- 10th Ave. makes more sense for the drop-off parking. The courtyard should face 10th Ave. The courtyard on Broadway is not practical or functional.
- The garage entry presents a safety concern.

Open Space/ Landscaping

- The programming of the open spaces isn't always clear from the drawings.
- The benches along the right of way will attract undesirable activity. Benches should be available and oriented to the residents.

Noise

- Mechanical noise produced by the garage and the HVAC system concerned a neighbor.

Preservation of Trees

- Many of the speakers praised the effort to preserve the trees.

DPD Letters received approximately 17 letters immediately prior to and after the Recommendation meeting. Most supported the changes to the proposal; however, other letters criticized the building orientation and its proximity to the south property line. Some of the issues in the letters pertained to SEPA issues such as traffic and sight lines.

Site Planning

A. Site Planning

- A-2 Streetscape Compatibility. The siting of buildings should acknowledge and reinforce the existing desirable spatial characteristics of the right-of-way.**

The Board accepted the orientation of the “L” shaped building.

- A-5 Respect for Adjacent Sites. Buildings should respect adjacent properties by being located on their sites to minimize disruption of the privacy and outdoor activities of residents in adjacent buildings.**

The Board expressed its satisfaction that the relationship of the proposed building to the townhouses to the south had been enhanced by the architect's changes---retention of trees along the south property, installation of additional trees, the elimination of balconies, and modulations in the setback from the property line

A-7 Residential Open Space. Residential projects should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space.

The applicant developed a series of discrete private and semi-private open spaces along the property edges in response to earlier guidance. Section E-2 of this report recommends that the landscape architect refine these spaces.

The Board also accepted the redesign of the northeast corner.

A-8 Parking and Vehicle Access. Siting should minimize the impact of automobile parking and driveways on the pedestrian environment, adjacent properties, and pedestrian safety.

The Board recommended granting the departure for a reduced curb cut width.

B. Height, Bulk and Scale

B-1 Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility. Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to near-by, less intensive zones. Projects on zone edges should be developed in a manner that creates a step in perceived height, bulk, and scale between anticipated development potential of the adjacent zones.

The proposal's massing provoked considerable deliberation over three meetings. In response to earlier discussion focused on the possibility of a setback at the third floor on the north façade, the Board agreed with the execution of the massing as presented at the Recommendation meeting.

The Board recommended granting the departure request to extend the maximum structure width from 120 feet to 178 feet as the scheme produced generous open spaces, preservation of trees and considerable modulation along the wall's length.

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

C-2 Architectural Concept and Consistency. Building design elements, details and massing should create a well-proportioned and unified building form and exhibit an overall architectural concept. Buildings should exhibit form and features identifying the functions within the building. In general, the roofline or top of the structure should be clearly distinguished from its facade walls.

For the Recommendation meeting, the applicant eliminated some of the perceived extraneous architectural embellishments from the design. However, the Board asked for additional modifications to the facades. See recommendations for C-4.

C-4 Exterior Finish Materials. Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.

After extensive deliberation, the Board recommended several refinements to simplify the materials and to emphasize the planarity of the walls. To achieve this aim, the overall number of separate materials should be reduced. For the Board, the use of both stucco and fiber cement board was excessive, encouraging the elimination of one of these materials. The excessive number of pieces as represented on Sheet A28 in the fiber cement board and trim should also be reduced to produce greater planarity. Acting to reduce some of the arbitrariness in the application of the materials, the Board recommended that rather than having the brick end midway between the level of the third floor line and the cornice, the brick should extend to the cornice. In special instances such as the northeast corner with its serrated or chevron design, the Board expressed its satisfaction with the visual break occurring at the floor line. Metal or slate should replace asphalt tiles (Sheet A28). The architect should also bring the brick to the metal window frame. The architect should strive to express a common language between the use of wood and fiber cement.

In sum, the changes or transitions to different materials should occur at logical planar shifts. The modulations or shifts in the many vertical planes, expressing each dwelling unit, were acceptable to the Board as the shadows produced by the shifts will provide depth and visual interest.

D. Pedestrian Environment

D-1 Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances. Convenient and attractive access to the building's entry should be provided. To ensure comfort and security, paths and entry areas should be sufficiently lighted and entry areas should be protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.

The applicant carved an open space in front of the primary residential entry near 10th Ave. E. The Board noted that the possible development of a drop-off area on Broadway at the courtyard would require changes to the entrance stairs from the sidewalk. A revised design would produce a more welcoming entry sequence beginning with a wider staircase.

D-3 Retaining Walls. Retaining walls near a public sidewalk that extend higher than eye level should be avoided where possible. Where higher retaining walls are unavoidable, they should be designed to reduce their impact on pedestrian comfort and to increase the visual interest along the streetscapes.

With the possible exception of the stairs to the courtyard on Broadway, the Board accepted the revisions to the retaining wall and parking plinth.

- D-5 Visual Impacts of Parking Structures.** The visibility of all at-grade parking structures or accessory parking garages should be minimized. The parking portion of a structure should be architecturally compatible with the rest of the structure and streetscape. Open parking spaces and carports should be screened from the street and adjacent properties.

Emission of garage exhaust would occur at the southwest corner of the site behind a water fountain in the courtyard. Plantings would surround the exhaust vent and obscure it from public view.

E. Landscaping

- E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site.** Landscaping, including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, site furniture, and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.

Prior to MUP issuance, the applicant will refine the landscaping to show greater detail. The Board recommended that paving patterns and materials, furniture, and the lighting concept plan will need to be reviewed and approved by the land use planner.

In addition, the landscape architect will refine the critical transitions (and terminations) between public open space, semi-private space and private space along the perimeter of the site for review by DPD staff. At the northeast corner, the designer should produce greater porosity between the public space along the sidewalk and the private realm but retain the secure boundaries as currently defined by the brick wall. In essence, the design should clarify the ownership of the corner and define it as public, semi-public or public space.

The location of the benches so close to the public sphere raised some doubts by the Board members. A possible reorientation of the benches or providing additional planting to screen the sitting areas would create a more suitable semi-public zone.

The Board, illuminating some of the public comment, observed that the area near the stairs leading to the courtyard on Broadway would be a suitable drop-off area. If the applicant seizes upon this idea, the stairs should be redesigned to accommodate residents waiting or being dropped off. The stairs should be more welcoming and not resemble a back route to the complex.

Board Recommendations: The recommendations summarized below were based on the plans submitted at the April 4, 2012 meeting. Design, siting or architectural details not specifically identified or altered in these recommendations are expected to remain as presented in the plans and other drawings available at the April 4th public meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities, and reviewing the plans and renderings, the four Design Review Board members present unanimously recommended approval of the subject design and the requested development standard departures from the requirements of the Land Use Code (listed below).

STANDARD	REQUIREMENT	REQUEST	JUSTIFICATION	RECOMMEN- DATION
1. Maximum Structure Width SMC 23.45.527 Table A.	Maximum structure width allowed is 120'.	178'. This is 58' or 48% greater than required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimizes the building mass on the south and west sides. Preserves mature trees along the site's perimeter. 	Approved
2. Driveway Width. SMC 23.54.030D.1.c.	Minimum width is 20'.	16' driveway width. A 4' reduction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimizes intrusion into the sidewalk. Adds four linear feet of additional landscaping to the pedestrian environment. 	Approved

The Board recommended the following **CONDITIONS** for the project. (Authority referenced in the letter and number in parenthesis):

1. Reduce the overall number of separate materials on the facades. The Board encouraged the elimination of either the stucco or the fiber cement board. (C-4)
2. Emphasize the planarity of the wall segments by reducing the number of pieces as represented on Sheet A28 in the fiber cement board and trim. (C-4)
3. Extend the brick to the cornice where it ends midway between the line of the third floor and the cornice. (C-4)
4. Replace the asphalt tile with slate, metal or some other higher quality material. (C-4)
5. Refine the landscaping to show greater detail of materials. The planner will review and approve paving patterns and materials, furniture types, and the lighting concept plan. (E-2)
6. Clarify and refine the critical transitions (and terminations) between public open spaces, semi-private open spaces and private open spaces along the perimeter of the site. The planner will review and approve the changes based on the Board's expectations. (E-2)
7. Provide greater porosity between the public space along the sidewalk and the private realm but retain the secure boundaries as currently defined by the brick wall. (E-2)
8. If the applicant chooses to create a drop-off area along Broadway E., the stairs leading to the courtyard should be redesigned to accommodate residents waiting or being dropped off. The stairs should be wider and more welcoming. (E-2)

DIRECTOR'S ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW

The Director finds no conflicts with SEPA requirements or state or federal laws, and has reviewed the City-wide Design Guidelines and finds that the Board neither exceeded its authority nor applied the guidelines inconsistently in the approval of this design. The Director agrees with the conditions recommended by the four Board members and the recommendation to approve the design, as stated above.

DECISION - DESIGN REVIEW

The proposed design is **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED**.

ANALYSIS - SEPA

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated December 29, 2012. The information in the checklist, project plans, and the experience of the lead agency with review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision. The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665 D) clarifies the relationship between codes, policies, and environmental review. Specific policies for each element of the environment, certain neighborhood plans and other policies explicitly referenced may serve as the basis for exercising substantive SEPA authority.

The Overview Policy states in part: "where City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation" (subject to some limitations). Under certain limitations and/or circumstances (SMC 25.05.665 D 1-7) mitigation can be considered. Thus, a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts is appropriate.

Short-term Impacts

Construction activities could result in the following adverse impacts: construction dust and storm water runoff, erosion, emissions from construction machinery and vehicles, increased particulate levels, increased noise levels, occasional disruption of adjacent vehicular and pedestrian traffic, a small increase in traffic and parking impacts due to construction related vehicles, and increases in greenhouse gas emissions. Several construction-related impacts are mitigated by existing City codes and ordinances applicable to the project such as: the Noise Ordinance, the Stormwater Grading and Drainage Control Code, the Street Use Ordinance, and the Building Code. The following analyzes construction-related noise, air quality, earth, grading, plants and animals, construction impacts, traffic and parking impacts as well as its mitigation.

Noise

Noise associated with construction of the mixed use building and future phases could adversely affect surrounding uses in the area, which include residential uses. Surrounding uses are likely to be adversely impacted by noise throughout the duration of construction activities. Due to the proximity of the project site to residential uses, the limitations of the Noise Ordinance are found to be inadequate to mitigate the potential noise impacts. Pursuant to the SEPA Overview Policy (SMC.25.05.665) and the SEPA Construction Impacts Policy (SMC 25.05.675 B), mitigation is warranted.

Prior to issuance of demolition, grading and building permits, the applicant will submit a construction noise mitigation plan. This plan will include steps 1) to limit noise decibel levels and duration and 2) procedures for advanced notice to surrounding properties. The plan will be subject to review and approval by DPD. In addition to the Noise Ordinance requirements to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby properties, all construction activities shall be limited to the following:

- 1) Non-holiday weekdays between 7:00 A.M and 6:00 P.M.
- 2) Non-holiday weekdays between 6:00 P.M. and 8:00 P.M limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
- 3) Saturdays between 9:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
- 4) Emergencies or work which must be done to coincide with street closures, utility interruptions or other similar necessary events, limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.

Air Quality

Construction for this project is expected to add temporarily particulates to the air that will result in a slight increase in auto-generated air contaminants from construction activities, equipment and worker vehicles; however, this increase is not anticipated to be significant. Federal auto emission controls are the primary means of mitigating air quality impacts from motor vehicles as stated in the Air Quality Policy (Section 25.05.675 SMC). To mitigate impacts of exhaust fumes on the directly adjacent residential uses, trucks hauling materials to and from the project site will not be allowed to queue on streets under windows of the nearby residential buildings.

Should asbestos be identified on the site, it must be removed in accordance with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) and City requirements. PSCAA regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality and require permits for removal of asbestos during demolition. In order to ensure that PSCAA will be notified of the proposed demolition, a condition will be included pursuant to SEPA authority under SMC 25.05.675A which requires that a copy of the PSCAA permit be attached to the demolition permit, prior to issuance. This will assure proper handling and disposal of asbestos.

Earth

The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code (SGDCC) requires preparation of a soils report to evaluate the site conditions and provide recommendations for safe construction on sites where grading will involve cuts or fills of greater than three feet in height or grading greater than 100 cubic yards of material.

The soils report, construction plans, and shoring of excavations as needed, will be reviewed by the DPD Geo-technical Engineer and Building Plans Examiner who will require any additional soils-related information, recommendations, declarations, covenants and bonds as necessary to assure safe grading and excavation. This project constitutes a "large project" under the terms of the SGDCC (SMC 22.802.015 D). As such, there are many additional requirements for erosion control including a provision for implementation of best management practices and a requirement for incorporation of an engineered erosion control plan which will be reviewed jointly by the DPD building plans examiner and geo-technical engineer prior to issuance of the permit. The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code provides extensive conditioning authority and prescriptive construction methodology to assure safe construction techniques are used; therefore, no additional conditioning is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

Grading

Excavation to construct the mixed use structure will be necessary. The maximum depth of the excavation is approximately 13 feet and will consist of an estimated 8,870 cubic yards of material. The soil removed will not be reused on the site and will need to be disposed off-site by trucks. City code (SMC 11.74) provides that material hauled in trucks not be spilled during transport. The City requires that a minimum of one foot of "freeboard" (area from level of material to the top of the truck container) be provided in loaded uncovered trucks which minimize the amount of spilled material and dust from the truck bed enroute to or from a site. Future phases of construction will be subject to the same regulations. No further conditioning of the grading/excavation element of the project is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

Plants and Animals

The surface parking lot, rung by a variety of trees within its perimeter, includes a Big Leaf Maple, designated as an exceptional tree based on Director's Rule 16-2008. Other trees include Norway Maples, Ash and Honey Locust among others. Within the parking lot, a row of Paper Birches and Honey Locust grow within an island separating the parking lot from the duplex. In addition, trees are located within the rights of way and on adjacent property to the south.

The applicant proposes a tree protection plan outlined by Gilles Consulting (prepared March 9, 2012) for the trees along the perimeter of the site. These measures, as outlined in Attachment 4 of the report, shall be followed for the designated trees including the exceptional tree, the Big Leaf Maple, located on the northwest corner of the site. Tree protection measures will need to be enforced for the two trees south of the existing garage on adjacent property.

Construction Impacts

Construction activities including construction worker commutes, truck trips, the operation of construction equipment and machinery, and the manufacture of the construction materials themselves result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant.

Traffic and Parking

Duration of construction of the apartment building may last approximately 18 months. During construction, parking demand will increase due to additional demand created by construction personnel and equipment. It is the City's policy to minimize temporary adverse impacts associated with construction activities and parking (SMC 25.05.675 B and M). Parking utilization along streets in the vicinity is near capacity and the demand for parking by construction workers during construction could reduce the supply of parking in the vicinity. Due to the large scale of the project, this temporary demand on the on-street parking in the vicinity due to construction workers' vehicles may be adverse. Upon completion of the parking garage, construction workers shall park in the garage. The authority to impose this condition is found in Section 25.05.675B2g of the Seattle SEPA Ordinance.

The construction of the project also will have adverse impacts on both vehicular and pedestrian traffic in the vicinity of the project site. During construction a temporary increase in traffic volumes to the site will occur, due to travel to the site by construction workers and the transport of construction materials. Approximately 8,870 cubic yards of soil are expected to be excavated from the project site. The soil removed for the garage structure will not be reused on the site and will need to be disposed off-site. Excavation and fill activity will require approximately 890 round trips with 10-yard hauling trucks or 445 round trips with 20-yard hauling trucks. Considering the large volumes of truck trips anticipated during construction, it is reasonable that truck traffic avoid the afternoon peak hours. Large (greater than two-axle) trucks will be prohibited from entering or exiting the site after 3:30 PM.

Truck access to and from the site shall be documented in a construction traffic management plan, to be submitted to DPD and SDOT prior to the beginning of construction. This plan also shall indicate how pedestrian connections around the site will be maintained during the construction period, with particular consideration given to maintaining pedestrian access along Broadway. Compliance with Seattle's Street Use Ordinance is expected to mitigate any additional adverse impacts to traffic which would be generated during construction of this proposal.

Long-term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal including: increased surface water runoff due to greater site coverage by impervious surfaces; increased bulk and scale on the site; increased traffic in the area; increased demand for parking; and increased light and glare.

Several adopted City codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. Specifically these are: The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code which requires on site collection of stormwater with provisions for controlled tightline release to an approved outlet and may require additional design elements to prevent isolated flooding; the City Energy Code which will require insulation for outside walls and energy efficient windows; and the Land Use Code which controls site coverage, setbacks, building height and use and contains other development and use regulations to assure compatible development. Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances is adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of most long-term impacts and no further conditioning is warranted by SEPA policies. However, due to the size and location of this proposal, green house gas emissions, historic preservation, traffic, parking impacts and public view protection warrant further analysis.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Operational activities, primarily vehicular trips associated with the project and the project's energy consumption, are expected to result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant.

Historic Preservation

The existing structure, built in 1942, was reviewed by the Department of Neighborhoods and determined that it is unlikely, due in part to a loss of integrity, that the existing mixed use building would meet the standards for designation as an individual landmark.

Transportation

The applicant submitted a traffic and parking study by Transportation Engineering Northwest (TENW) documenting the likely transportation and parking impacts from the project. The project is forecast to generate approximately 273 daily vehicle trips, with 21 trips occurring during the morning peak hour and 27 in the afternoon peak hour. Vehicle access is proposed onto Highland Street, approximately 70' east of the Highland/Broadway E intersection.

Roadways near the project site have sufficient capacity to accommodate this modest increase in traffic, and no adverse operational impacts are expected. However, the entering sight distance to the south along 10th Avenue E is constrained on both the east and west approaches of Highland Street at its intersection with 10th Avenue E. Parking along 10th Avenue E just south of the Highland Street intersection was observed to limit the available sight distance to approximately 75 feet to the south. The project will be adding traffic to the eastbound approach of the Highland/10th intersection. Creation of a 50-foot passenger load/unload zone on the west side of 10th Avenue E immediately south of Highland Avenue would improve the available intersection sight distance for this approach, as well as provide a passenger loading zone for the proposed project and other nearby institutional and multifamily buildings.

The project will close two curb cuts along 10th Avenue E adjacent to the site, resulting in three additional on-street parking stalls; this would restore any parking stalls lost through restricting parking immediately south of the Highland Street intersection.

Parking

The proposed parking garage to be constructed with the project would include 85 parking stalls. The parking analysis provided by TENW estimated the project's peak parking demand using data from the Institute of Transportation Engineers' *Parking Generation, Fourth Edition*. The 70 apartment units are estimated to generate a peak parking demand of 68 vehicles. As the project's peak parking demand would be accommodated by the proposed parking supply, the project is not expected to generate any direct parking impacts on neighboring streets.

However, development of the site will remove a private surface parking lot with 74 stalls. TENW surveyed occupancy of this lot at various times over several days; on average, about 20 vehicles park in the lot during weekday mornings, and about 19 during weekday evenings. Nineteen vehicles were counted Saturday morning and 28 vehicles Sunday morning, at a time coinciding with services at the adjacent St. Marks' Cathedral.

TENW also surveyed on-street parking availability within 800' of the project site, to ascertain existing parking utilization rates and estimate the rates that would result if all the parked vehicles displaced by the site development chose to continue to park in the immediate vicinity. Within this area, some parking spaces are within residential parking zones, and are limited to two hours or four hours for vehicles without appropriate stickers; other spaces are unrestricted.

Data gathered by TENW indicate that existing utilization rates range from 55 - 61% during weekdays, with a peak of 64% on Sundays, considering all available on-street parking. By parking type, utilization of 2-hour stalls during peak demand periods on Sunday mornings is 72%, and unrestricted stall utilization during this time period is 76%. Without the surface parking lot available, peak on-street parking utilization would range between 63% and 70% on a typical weekday. On-street utilization would be greatest on Sunday mornings during services at

St. Marks' Cathedral, with a rate of 76%. The duration of parking demand within the existing off-street surface lot is unknown, although it is likely that some of the Sunday demand is of short duration, related to attendance at St. Marks' services. TENW calculated expected on-street utilization rates without the capacity from the 2-hour stalls. Under this assumption, peak utilization would increase slightly, ranging from 65 – 74% on weekdays and 77% on Sunday. These data indicate that no significant parking impacts are expected to occur as result of displacement of the existing demand at the private surface parking lot.

DECISION - SEPA

This decision was made after review by the responsible official on behalf of the lead agency of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the responsible department. This constitutes the Threshold Determination and form. The intent of this declaration is to satisfy the requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21C), including the requirement to inform the public agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

[X] Determination of Non-Significance. This proposal has been determined to not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is not required under RCW 43.21C.030 2C.

[] Determination of Significance. This proposal has or may have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is required under RCW 43.21C.030 2C.

CONDITIONS – DESIGN REVIEW

Prior to MUP Issuance

Revise plans sets to show:

1. Reduce the overall number of separate materials on the facades. The Board encouraged the elimination of either the stucco or the fiber cement board.
2. Emphasize the planarity of the wall segments by reducing the number of pieces as represented on Sheet A28 in the fiber cement board and trim.
3. Extend the brick to the cornice where it ends midway between the line of the third floor and the cornice.
4. Replace the asphalt tile with slate, metal or some other higher quality material.
5. Refine the landscaping to show greater detail of materials. The planner will review and approve paving patterns and materials, furniture types, and the lighting concept plan.
6. Clarify and refine the critical transitions (and terminations) between public open spaces, semi-private open spaces and private open spaces along the perimeter of the site. The planner will review and approve the changes based on the Board's expectations.

7. Provide greater porosity between the public space along the sidewalk and the private realm but retain the secure boundaries as currently defined by the brick wall.
8. If the applicant chooses to create a drop-off area along Broadway E., the stairs leading to the courtyard should be redesigned to accommodate residents waiting or being dropped off. The stairs should be wider and more welcoming.

Prior to Building Application

9. Include the departure matrix in the zoning summary section on all subsequent building permit plans. Add call-out notes on appropriate plan and elevation drawings in the updated MUP plans and on all subsequent building permit plans.

Prior to Commencement of Construction

10. Arrange a pre-construction meeting with the building contractor, building inspector, and land use planner to discuss expectations and details of the Design Review component of the project.

Prior to Issuance of all Construction Permits

11. Embed the MUP conditions in the cover sheet for all subsequent permits including updated building permit drawings.

Prior to Issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy

12. Compliance with all images and text on the MUP drawings, design review meeting guidelines and approved design features and elements (including exterior materials, landscaping and ROW improvements) shall be verified by the DPD planner assigned to this project (Bruce P. Rips, 206.615-1392). An appointment with the assigned Land Use Planner must be made at least three (3) working days in advance of field inspection. The Land Use Planner will determine whether submission of revised plans is required to ensure that compliance has been achieved.

For the Life of the Project

13. Any proposed changes to the exterior of the building or the site or must be submitted to DPD for review and approval by the Land Use Planner (Bruce Rips, 206.615-1392). Any proposed changes to the improvements in the public right-of-way must be submitted to DPD and SDOT for review and for final approval by SDOT.

CONDITIONS – SEPA

Prior to Issuance of a Demolition, Grading, or Building Permit

14. Attach a copy of the PSCAA demolition permit to the building permit set of plans.

15. A construction traffic management plan shall be submitted to DPD and SDOT prior to the beginning of construction. This plan will identify construction materials staging area; truck access routes to and from the site for excavation and construction phases; and sidewalk and street closures with neighborhood notice and posting procedures.
16. Submit the arborist's tree protection plan and identification of trees. Additional measures should ensure protection of the Big Leaf Maple during construction.

During Construction

17. Condition(s) to be enforced during construction shall be posted at the site in a location on the property line that is visible and accessible to the public and to construction personnel from the street right-of-way. The conditions will be affixed to placards prepared by DPD. The placards will be issued along with the building permit set of plans. The placards shall be laminated with clear plastic or other weatherproofing material and shall remain in place for the duration of construction.
18. Grading, delivery and pouring of concrete and similar noisy activities will be prohibited on Saturdays and Sundays. In addition to the Noise Ordinance requirements, to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby residences, only the low noise impact work such as that listed below, will be permitted on Saturdays from 9:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.:
 - A. Surveying and layout.
 - B. Testing and tensioning P. T. (post tensioned) cables, requiring only hydraulic equipment (no cable cutting allowed).
 - C. Other ancillary tasks to construction activities will include site security, surveillance, monitoring, and maintenance of weather protecting, water dams and heating equipment.
19. In addition to the Noise Ordinance, requirements to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby properties, all construction activities shall be limited to the following:
 - A. Non-holiday weekdays between 7:00 A.M and 6:00 P.M.
 - B. Non-holiday weekdays between 6:00 P.M. and 8:00 P.M limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
 - C. Saturdays between 9:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
 - D) Emergencies or work which must be done to coincide with street closures, utility interruptions or other similar necessary events, limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
20. Large (greater than two-axle) trucks will be prohibited from entering or exiting the site after 3:30 PM.

21. Non-noisy activities, such as site security, monitoring, weather protection shall not be limited by this condition.
22. Follow specific tree protection measures outlined in the tree protection plan for all designated trees including the Big Leaf Maple.

Prior to Issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy

23. Subject to approval by the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), provide a 50-foot passenger load/unload zone on the west side of 10th Avenue E immediately south of Highland Avenue to improve the available intersection sight distance for eastbound traffic on Highland Avenue.

Compliance with all applicable conditions must be verified and approved by the Land Use Planner, Bruce Rips, (206-615-1392) at the specified development stage, as required by the Director's decision. The Land Use Planner shall determine whether the condition requires submission of additional documentation or field verification to assure that compliance has been achieved.

Signature: (signature on file) Date: May 24, 2012
Bruce P. Rips, AAIA, AICP
Department of Planning and Development